

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I appreciate the distinguished leader's response in regards to this issue.

Let me just point out, if I might, that we now have 300,000 fewer people that are seeking employment because they have given up, and that brings down the unemployment rate when in reality it is higher than it has ever been. And the last time we did not extend the unemployment, the last recession, we did that when there was a significant growth in employment. We have had 1,000 new jobs created in the last month. We have a net loss of over 2.4 million jobs in the last 3 years.

I would just urge the distinguished leader to talk to members of both caucuses. This is an important issue. There are a lot of people who are being lost in this economy that need this help. And I would just urge the leader to consider scheduling debate on the floor on the extension of the Federal unemployment accounts. We have bills sponsored by both Democrats and Republicans on this issue. It is an important subject. And I thank my friend from Georgia for yielding to me.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, JANUARY 23, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. on Friday, January 23, 2004.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, JANUARY 23, 2004 TO TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Friday, January 23, 2004, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 27, 2004, for morning hour debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF HONORABLE MAC THORNBERRY TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH JANUARY 27, 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 21, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MAC THORNBERRY to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through January 27, 2004.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the appointment is approved.

There was no objection.

□ 1315

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

REGARDING THE NEW MEDICARE LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in last year's State of the Union address, President Bush called Medicare "the binding commitment of a caring society." Last night in his State of the Union address, the President said the Medicare prescription drug bill that was enacted last year "kept a basic commitment to our seniors."

The new Medicare law kept a basic commitment all right, but as the tens of thousands of seniors who have quit AARP would likely agree, the commitment was not to America's seniors. The new Medicare law means an additional \$139 billion in profit to the drug industry over the next 8 years. The President did fulfill his commitment, a commitment he had to the drug industry. The new Medicare bill the President signed means an additional \$14 billion in subsidies to the insurance industry over the next 10 years, again a commitment the President fulfilled to his insurance company backers and contributors. But the President's commitment meant virtually nothing to seniors, many of whom will not have access to any benefit until 2006 and after that will have access to only a very inadequate drug benefit. The new benefit will cover less than half of a senior's drug costs. The average senior would do better traveling to Canada to purchase her prescription drugs. Of course the Bush administration has been busy pressuring Canadian pharmacies to stop selling medicine to American consumers.

Again, the President's commitment to the drug companies won out. The reason drug prices are lower in Canada is because the Canadian government negotiates price with the drug industry. But the new Medicare law expressly forbids the U.S. Government from negotiating with the drug industry to bring drug prices down. Get that. This new drug bill prohibits the government from using its buying power, representing 40 million Medicare beneficiaries, this new law prohibits the government from negotiating with the drug industry to bring prices down. That is why the drug industry's profits are set to explode under the President's new Medicare privatization bill. Again, it is a commitment not to America's seniors but a commitment President Bush made to his drug company contributors. If seniors had asked the President and the Congress to short-change them on drug coverage while giving the drug industry a free ride, it would be accurate to say that yes, he really has fulfilled his commitment to them, but that is clearly not what seniors asked us to do.

Medicare HMOs enjoyed a 118 percent increase in profits last year. Yet we are about to hand them an additional \$14.3 billion. According to the General Accounting Office, we already overpay HMOs by 20 percent. This new law will ensure we shower them with more money, we waste even more taxpayer dollars subsidizing the insurance industry, again a commitment to the insurance industry and the President's financial contributors in the insurance industry and HMOs, a commitment he made to them when they were so supportive in his campaign.

Mr. Speaker, in the end, we have a President who always consistently makes a choice. If it is a choice between corporate interests and the public interest, this President chooses corporate interests every single time.

AL QAEDA DEALS HEROIN TO FUND TERRORISM OPERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from Pakistan's frontier where Osama bin Laden is likely hiding. We describe bin Laden as a terrorist. While that label applies, I think we can be more accurate. He has become a narco-terrorist.

During my mission, I learned that bin Laden's source of donated funds has been reduced. In response, bin Laden has become one of Pakistan's top heroin dealers. Kandahar trafficker Haji Bashir Noorzai provides 1,000 kilograms of heroin each month to bin Laden's organization. That provides al Qaeda with \$24 million a year to fund his attacks against the West.

If we are to catch bin Laden and to wrap up his organization, we must attack his new source of income, heroin.

This triggers a change in the policy of the international coalition fighting al Qaeda. We should make this change. We should raise the rewards for catching bin Laden and attack his heroin organization.

There are at least three major drug trafficking organizations now operating in Afghanistan, all with links to Pakistan: The Taliban, the HIG and bin Laden's al Qaeda. Last week, coalition forces made their first effort and hit a major drug lab in eastern Afghanistan that captured \$100 million worth of heroin that could have supported terror against the West.

Next week, I will be offering legislation to increase the rewards for the capture of terrorists but to also expand the rewards program to involve the rewards program in capturing narco-terrorists, and also to loosen up that rewards program so that we can provide valuable commodities which speak much more directly to the rural families in Pakistan and Afghanistan, providing, for example, motorcycles, farm implements or trucks for the capture of these well-known terrorists. The terrorists are changing their source of financing and the United States needs to change its strategy to dry up that financing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BISHOP of Utah). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ISSA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHUSTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

INTRODUCTION OF UNITED STATES SEAPORT MULTIYEAR SECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the President's message last night on the critical need for security enhancement around our seaports and airports, I am introducing legislation today, the United States Seaport Multiyear Security Enhancement Act, and I ask all of my colleagues to support it. This is a bipartisan issue. Seaport security continues to be an ongoing national concern that Congress cannot afford to ignore any longer.

The United States Seaport Multiyear Security Enhancement Act is much-needed legislation that seeks to provide a steady, predictable stream of funding for port security projects. In short, this legislation creates a port security grant program within the Homeland Security Department. Our Nation's 361 seaports are considered a major terrorist target. It is known that al Qaeda has strong ties to the shipping industry and that one of the aims of this terrorist network is to weaken the economic security of our country. Our Nation's coastline is our longest border, which is a 95,000-mile coast that includes the Great Lakes and inland waterways.

Protecting America's seaports is critical to the Nation's economic growth, vitality and security. Seaports handle 95 percent of our Nation's overseas trade by volume, support the mobilization and deployment of U.S. Armed Forces and serve as transit points for millions of cruise and ferry passengers. Maritime industries contribute \$742 billion per year to the U.S. gross national product.

The United States Coast Guard has issued final regulations that call for immediate and long-term investment in securing our seaports. According to the U.S. Coast Guard, implementing these regulations that directly address our seaport security needs will cost \$1.125 billion in the first year and \$5.45 billion over 10 years. To date, security funding to our seaports has been woefully underfunded. Congress has provided \$442 million in seaport security funding through three rounds of competitive grant funding and from the Office of Domestic Preparedness. Given our Nation's economic dependence on our seaports and our ongoing national security concerns, Mr. Speaker, seaport security funding and the need for Federal support for our Nation's security should be ongoing.

Given the enormity of these seaport capital infrastructure projects, my legislation seeks to do the following: Establish a multiyear seaport grant program that resembles the letter of intent measures established in the aviation security program. And it calls for multiyear grants and \$800 million per year for port security grant funding. The program would be authorized for 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is much needed. According to the Department of Homeland Security, to date, \$1 out of every \$10 requested for port security grants is funded. That is one out of 10. The continuing security and economic needs that face our Nation and our seaports should be recognized by the establishment of the U.S. Seaport Multiyear Security Enhancement Act, the legislation that I am introducing

today. I ask all of my colleagues for their support of this very important piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MEEK of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DO NOT TRIVIALIZE NEED TO INTERNATIONALIZE IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, last night in his State of the Union address to the Nation, President Bush attempted to deride critics who have called upon him to broaden the coalition and internationalize the effort to provide security to Iraq and rebuild that war-torn nation. The President said, "This particular criticism is hard to explain to our partners in Britain." And then he named 15 other countries and cited 17 others.

I respect the contributions that these other nations have made in Iraq, some of which like Spain, Italy and Japan have also lost sons to the war in Iraq.